

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

ANDRE D. BOYD, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TDCJ,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:23-cv-12-JDK-JDL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

In this case, twenty-five TDCJ Coffield Unit inmates jointly sued the Coffield Unit alleging violations of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (“RLUIPA”). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On January 10, 2023, Judge Love issued a deficiency order requiring each plaintiff to either individually pay the \$402 filing fee or submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* by February 16, 2023. Docket No. 2. None of the plaintiffs has complied with that order. Accordingly, Judge Love issued three Reports and Recommendations recommending that the Court dismiss the various Plaintiffs for want of prosecution and failure to obey a Court order. Docket Nos. 33, 35, 36. The Reports were mailed to Plaintiffs, but no objections have been received.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court


examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, no Plaintiff objected in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Reports and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Reports and Recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket Nos. 33, 35, 36) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for want of prosecution and failure to obey a Court order.

Signed this

May 4, 2023


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE